



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/709,254	04/23/2004	James M. Murphy	PU2212	3253
23454	7590	03/10/2006	EXAMINER	
CALLAWAY GOLF COMPANY 2180 RUTHERFORD ROAD CARLSBAD, CA 92008-7328			PASSANITI, SEBASTIANO	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		3711		

DATE MAILED: 03/10/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

5

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/709,254	MURPHY ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Sebastiano Passaniti	3711	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on see detailed Office action.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                            2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-64 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 31-40 and 62-64 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-30 and 41-61 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>04/23/2004</u> .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: <u>Sample TD and §3.73</u> .

## DETAILED ACTION

This Office action is responsive to communication received 12/27/2005 – Election.

Claims 1-64 remain pending.

Applicant's election without traverse of Species I (claims 1-30 and 41-61) in the reply filed on 12/27/2005 is acknowledged.

Claims 31-40 and 62-64 have been withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 12/27/2005.

Following is an action on the MERITS:

### ***Double Patenting***

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir.

1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-30 and 41-60 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as unpatentable over claims 1-15 of U.S. Patent No. 6,491,592. For double patenting to exist as between the rejected claims and the patented claims 1-15, it must be determined that the rejected claims are not patentably distinct from claims 1-15 of the patent. In order to make this determination, it first must be determined whether there are any differences between the rejected claims and patented claims 1-15 and, if so, whether those differences render the claims patentably distinct.

By way of example only, instant claim 11 (dependent from claim 1) recites that "the aft-body is composed of a plurality of plies of pre-peg material" in combination with

a face component of metal material, a return portion and a coefficient of restitution of 0.81 and 0.94.

It is clear that all the elements of claim 11 are to be found in the patented claims. The difference between instant claim 11 and claims 1-15 of the patent lies in the fact that the patent claims include many more elements and are thus much more specific. Thus the invention of claims 1-15 of the patent is in effect a “species” of the “generic” invention of claim 11. It has been held that the generic invention is “anticipated” by the “species”. See *In re Goodman*, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Since claim 11 is anticipated by claims 1-15 of the patent, it is not patentably distinct from claims 1-15 of the patent.

The remaining limitations of the instant application may be found in the '592 patent and, as an example only, note the following:

As to instant claim 2, see claim 2 of the '592 patent.

As to instant claim 3, see claim 3 of the '592 patent.

As to instant claim 4, see claim 4 of the '592 patent.

As to instant claim 5, see claim 5 of the '592 patent.

As to instant claim 6, see claim 6 of the '592 patent.

As to instant claim 7, see claim 7 of the '592 patent.

As to instant claim 8, see claim 8 of the '592 patent.

As to instant claim 9, see claim 10 of the '592 patent.

As to instant claim 52, see claim 14 of the '592 patent.

Claims 1-9, 11, 20, 22, 30, 41, 43, 45, 46, 51, 52, 54 and 61 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as unpatentable over claims 1-13 of U.S. Patent No. 6,739,982. It is clear that all the elements of claims 1-9, 11, 20, 22, 30, 41, 43, 45, 46, 51, 52, 54 and 61 are to be found in the patented claims. The difference between instant claim and claims 1-13 of the patent lies in the fact that the patent claims include many more elements and are thus much more specific. Thus the invention of claims 1-13 of the patent is in effect a "species" of the "generic" invention of claims 1-9, 11, 20, 22, 30, 41, 43, 45, 46, 51, 52, 54 and 61. It has been held that the generic invention is "anticipated" by the "species". See *In re Goodman*, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Since the instant claims are anticipated by claims 1-13 of the patent, they are not patentably distinct from claims 1-13 of the patent.

Claims 1, 6 and 7 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as unpatentable over claims 1-7 of U.S. Patent No. 6,354,962. It is clear that all the elements of claims 1, 6 and 7 are to be found in the patented claims. The difference between instant claim and claims 1-7 of the patent lies in the fact that the patent claims include many more elements and are thus much more specific. Thus the invention of claims 1-7 of the patent is in effect a "species" of the "generic" invention of claims 1, 6 and 7. It has been held that the generic invention is "anticipated" by the "species". See *In re Goodman*, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Since the instant claims are anticipated by claims 1-7 of the patent, they are not patentably distinct from claims 1-7 of the patent.

Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 9, 20, 30, 52 and 61 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as unpatentable over claims 1-10 of U.S. Patent No. 6,758,763. It is clear that all the elements of claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 9, 20, 30, 52 and 61 are to be found in the patented claims. The difference between instant claim and claims 1-10 of the patent lies in the fact that the patent claims include many more elements and are thus much more specific. Thus the invention of claims 1-10 of the patent is in effect a "species" of the "generic" invention of claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 9, 20, 30, 52 and 61. It has been held that the generic invention is "anticipated" by the "species". See *In re Goodman*, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Since the instant claims are anticipated by claims 1-10 of the patent, they are not patentably distinct from claims 1-10 of the patent.

Claims 1-6, 9, 11, 13-18, 20, 22, 24-30, 41, 43, 45-52 and 56-61 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as unpatentable over claims 1-12 of U.S. Patent No. 6,994,637. It is clear that all the elements of claims 1-6, 9, 11, 13-18, 20, 22, 24-30, 41, 43, 45-52 and 56-61 are to be found in the patented claims. The difference between instant claim and claims 1-12 of the patent lies in the fact that the patent claims include many more elements and are thus much more specific. Thus the invention of claims 1-12 of the patent is in effect a "species" of the "generic" invention of claims 1-6, 9, 11, 13-18, 20, 22, 24-30, 41, 43, 45-52 and 56-61. It has been held that the generic invention is "anticipated" by the "species". See *In re Goodman*, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Since the instant

claims are anticipated by claims 1-12 of the patent, they are not patentably distinct from claims 1-12 of the patent.

***Comments on Double Patenting***

Applicant's attention is drawn to the listing of applications related to the instant application, shown in the continuity information (below). Applicant is respectfully reminded to maintain a clear line of demarcation among all of the claims of the instant application and any related application in order to avoid the need to address further instances with respect to obviousness-type double patenting between the instant claims and any one of the plethora of related applications (or patents matriculating therefrom) that may arise during the course of prosecution of the instant application.

09481167 is a continuation in part of 09431982  
09548314 is a continuation in part of 09431982  
09548531 is a continuation in part of 09431982  
09548538 is a continuation in part of 09431982  
09548968 is a continuation in part of 09431982  
09606809 is a continuation in part of 09481167  
09683118 is a continuation of 09431982  
09683401 is a division of 09548538  
09683402 is a division of 09548968  
09683856 is a continuation in part of 09906889  
09683860 is a continuation in part of 09906889  
09683896 is a continuation in part of 09906889  
09683906 is a continuation of 09431982  
09705253 is a continuation in part of 09431982  
09906889 is a continuation in part of 09431982  
10063266 is a continuation of 09906889  
10063393 is a continuation in part of 09906889  
10063927 is a continuation of 09606809  
10065871 is a continuation in part of 09906889  
10248742 is a continuation of 10065871  
10249054 is a continuation of 09683906  
10249510 is a continuation in part of 09683860  
10249782 is a continuation in part of 09683860  
10250089 is a continuation of 09683856

Art Unit: 3711

10604370 is a continuation of 10249054  
10605291 is a continuation of 10063927  
10655142 is a continuation of 10249054  
10709213 is a continuation of 10249510  
10709247 is a continuation of 10065871  
10709254 is a continuation of 10065871  
10709618 is a continuation of 10247742  
10709914 is a continuation in part of 10065871  
10710352 is a continuation in part of 10065871  
10906796 is a continuation of 10605377  
10925529 is a continuation in part of 10709213  
10936868 is a continuation in part of 10925529  
11275693 is a continuation of 10604370  
11276059 is a continuation of 10604370

***Terminal Disclaimer***

Enclosed with this Office action is a sample terminal disclaimer which is effective to overcome an obviousness-type double patenting rejection over a prior patent (37 CFR 1.1321(b) and (c)).

Also enclosed is a sample Statement Under 37 CFR 3.73(b) (Form PTO/SB/96) which an assignee may use in order to ensure compliance with the rule. Part A of the Statement is used when there is a single assignment from the inventor(s). Part B of the Statement is used when there is a chain of title. The "Copies of assignments..." box should be checked when the assignment document(s) (set forth in part A or part B) is/are not recorded in the Office, and a copy of the assignment document(s) is/are attached. When the "Copies of assignments..." box is checked, either the part A box or the part B box, as appropriate, must be checked, and the "Reel\_\_\_\_\_, Frame\_\_\_\_\_" entries should be left blank. If the part B box is checked, and copies of assignments are

Art Unit: 3711

not included, the "From: \_\_\_\_\_ To: \_\_\_\_\_" blank(s) must be filled in. This statement should be used the first time an assignee seeks to take action in an application under 37 CFR 3.73(b), e.g., when signing a terminal disclaimer or a power of attorney.

***Claim Objections***

Claims 1, 20, 41 and 52 objected to because of the following informalities: In line 3 of each of these claims, the term --a-- should be inserted between "having" and "striking". Appropriate correction is required.

***Comments on IDS***

With respect to the IDS, received 04/23/2004, the relevance of the citation to Wallace (U.S. Patent No. 6,310,185) is not understood. The reference is drawn to recombinant human anti-Lewis Y antibodies. Clarification is requested.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sebastiano Passaniti whose telephone number is 571-272-4413. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday (6:30AM - 3:00PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eugene L. Kim can be reached on 571-272-4463. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

S.Passaniti/sp  
March 5, 2006



**Sebastiano Passaniti**  
Primary Examiner